DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 407 363 SP 037 273

AUTHOR Heyning, Katharina E.
TITLE Rationality, Technology and Reform: Examining the "Governmentality" of Certification Change.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; Educational Policy; *Government School Relationship; Hermeneutics; Higher Education; *Politics of Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Primary Education; Schools of Education; State Regulation; *Teacher Certification; Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS Foucault (Michel); State Role; *University of Wisconsin Madison

ABSTRACT

This study explored the university/state relationship during a time of teacher education certification reform at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Data for the study consisted of archival texts including elementary education area faculty meeting minutes and departmental memos, creating a case study of reform. Michel Foucault's notion of governmentality was utilized to frame the examination in a way that would draw attention to the power relationships and historical constructions within the institution. The text was examined for evidence of political relationships and technologies of rule. Two issues were addressed: (1) how the relationship between the university and the state was made visible in terms of political rationalities; and (2) which governmental technologies of the state and the university were visible in the text during the construction of the PK-3 program and how each one was discussed. The study concluded that several political technologies were visible in the text, including a moral or political framework, excess documentation, and time-dependency. Additionally, when examining the government processes through the guise of governmentality, the university/state dichotomy dissolved. (Contains 49 references.) (Author/ND)

RATIONALITY, TECHNOLOGY AND REFORM: EXAMINING THE "GOVERNMENTALITY" OF CERTIFICATION CHANGE

Katharina E. Heyning

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Mailing address: P.O. Box 14535, Madison, WI 53714-0535
Email: kheyning@facstaff.wisc.edu

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
March 24-28 - Chicago

Session 26.31 - Education Reform and Postmodern Constructions:
Theory and Practice in Mobilizing the "New" Teacher

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to explore the university/state relationship during a time of teacher education certification reform at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Data for this study consist of archival texts including elementary education area and staff meeting minutes and departmental memos, creating a case study of reform. Foucault's notion of governmentality is utilized to frame the examination in a way that draws attention to the power relationships and historical constructions within the institution. Using this concept, the text is examined for evidence of political rationalizations and technologies of rule, what Rose and Miller call the "problematics of government." Two questions are asked in this study: 1) How is the relationship between the university and state made visible in terms of political rationalities? 2) What governmental technologies of the state and the university are visible in the text during the construction of the program and how are each discussed? The study concludes that several political technologies were visible in the text including a moral or political framework, excess documentation, and time-dependency. Additionally, when examining the governing processes through the guise of governmentality, the university/state dichotomy dissolves.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to explore the university/state relationship during a time of teacher education certification reform. In the spring of 1991 approximately thirty students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison enrolled in a newly created program leading to teacher certification in preschool through grade three (PK3). The new PK3 concentration was unusual for several reasons. First it reflected a national discourse about the "professionalism" of early childhood educators. Second, it emerged as a direct result of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction's (DPI) efforts to mandate teacher education reform through altered teacher licensure requirements. Third, it allowed students to pursue early childhood certification through either the School of Family Resources and Consumer Sciences (FRCS) or the School of Education (SOE).

This paper explores the university/state relationship represented in the textual artifacts left by the Elementary Education Area (EEA) faculty during the construction of the PK3 program. The texts chosen for this study consisted of EEA faculty meeting minutes, memos and informational handouts periodically catalogued in notebooks and filed in a department office. Throughout this paper I will use the broader term "texts" to refer to these records. The texts are analyzed as a form of discourse to help expose the power dynamics and complexities of teacher education reform in a large research-oriented university.

To enable such an examination, I will use a social epistemology of education reform as a method of social inquiry. A social epistemology of educational reform views elements of institutional practice as historically formed patterns of power relations. Knowledge, as linked with power, is intertwined with social practices and becomes accessible to social inquiry (Popkewitz, 1991). This technique will allow a more in-depth analysis of how the university/state relationship is understood through the rationalities and technologies that allow the use of power to govern.

The first section of this paper will present a framework for analyzing history and historical texts as a form of discourse. The second section will discuss specific points related to the study of the university/state relationship. This will foreshadow the textual analysis and guiding questions, which completes the third section. The final section will review the findings and summarize the results.

HISTORY AS TEXTUAL ARCHAEOLOGY

One of the fundamental aspects of this project was determining how to study past programmatic reforms. Indeed, the very idea of writing or reading 'history' is not without debate. In the past half century, there has been an increased focus on history's relationship with sociology, psychology, and semiotics — particularly within the study of history and the philosophy of science

(Hunt, 1986; Hunt, 1989). The historian, in interpreting the past, necessarily takes an active role in recreating the reality he or she sees there. Interpretive historical neutrality, while seductive, remains a chimera.

History is often thought of as a study remote from the present. In *Debates With Historians*, Pieter Geyl writes "history is an active force in the struggles of every generation and the historian by his interpretation of the past, consciously or half-consciously or even unconsciously, takes his part in them, for good or for evil (Geyl, 1958, p. 264). History is not inevitably useful and the historian cannot choose to remain neutral. Howard Zinn compares history to a jungle and states "The only thing I am really sure of is that we who plunge into the jungle need to think about what we are doing, because there *is* somewhere we want to go" (Zinn, 1985). The study of any historical episode, therefore, involves more than the chronologicalization of "facts." It involves the perceptions of the researcher through their interpretation of the subject matter. The idea that historical study is more than the documentation of individual political acts has been taken up by various theorists. Nowhere has this idea been more thoroughly explored than in France, where the disciplines of epistemology, history and the philosophy of science have been areas of continual philosophic debate for the past fifty years (Lemert, 1981).[1]

The archival data chosen for this examination consisted of EEA faculty meeting minutes and memos. It is important to recognize that these texts were not seen as a complete representation of the events that happened in the department. In using them I was not trying to recreate or piece together a specific chronology of events that happened, but rather I used them as a "window" on the action. The choice of texts may, at first glance, appear limited in scope. Other records of events are available and could have been used in this study. However, my decision to limit the data to EEA faculty meeting minutes, departmental memos and informational handouts does not equate a limitation in analysis. It is the intent of this study to demonstrate how the historically formed rules and patterns of regulation apparent in the text helped to form an apparatus of power which embodied principles for action within the university. The texts under examination represent the "everyday spaces" of teacher education practice and the rules and regulations which become apparent in the analysis are not limited to the use of these texts alone. The rituals of documentation become a construction that is visible in other texts and the daily lives of individuals. The analysis of *any* university text can yield important information about the historical constructions of teacher education reform and practice.

One long-standing methodology used in the examination of historical documents is to view them as keys to unlocking the thoughts and actions of those who produced them. Using the "objective" linguistic data of the text, historians attempt to reconstruct the inner thoughts and life of the author. The aim of the researcher is to locate meaning within some underlying framework, metaphorical system, or secret decoding process. Text is seen as a purely symbolic artifact of

human symbolic activity. It is a written representation of "reality" or statement of experience where "truth" is in the eye of the beholder (Bazerman, 1992). The trouble with this type of examination is that it can result in discursive abstractions where texts mean nothing beyond those of the writer. There is the ever-present chance of developing postmodern rhetoric or textual narcissism (Baker, 1991; Cocks, 1989).

In contrast, this study draws upon the work of Michel Foucault to employ an archaeological investigation where the texts are examined as *artifacts* in the study. Foucault views the statements made in documents as monuments and objects of study in their own right, subject to specific rules of discursive formation (Gutting, 1989). This form of investigation describes discursive formations without temporal relationships (Foucault, 1972). Similar to structuralist methodologies such as linguistics and ethnology, an archaeology of knowledge displaces "man" from his privileged position at the center of thought. Foucault's archaeology of knowledge differs from structuralism, however, in its concern for actual occurrences and their effects instead of their structural possibilities. Instead of looking for long-term continuities and gradual changes, the move away from "man" as the fundamental subjects places a greater emphasis on the sharp ruptures in a procession of ideas. Instead of looking for a succession of thought, an archaeological investigation uncovers discontinuities and breaks in the chronology. This allows for a more careful examination of how a series of events may become an object of discourse that can be recognized, described, clarified and elaborated. For this study, the creation of the PK3 program is examined through the EEA meeting minutes and memos kept during a 10 year span of time.

In my use of Foucault, I have examined the text as a form of socially constructed discourse. By discourse, I mean that the interpretation of the text is viewed as a negotiated endeavor concerned with the nature of interpretation and the subject matter being interpreted (White, 1978). All discourse takes into account differences of opinion as to its own authority. When applied to textual analysis, these differences of opinion are found between the reader's analysis and the (unknown) meaning set forth by the writer. Not only does the language used indicate various forms of meaning by the way it shifts, recedes, fractures and disperses and defers dialogue, it also represents a singular interpretation of a social event recorded in a particular way (Cherryholmes, 1990). There has been a growing recognition that any statement of experience, oral or written, can be "read" as discursive practice (Klein, 1992). This widened view has linked power and authority to text and placed it in a social space that can be examined and interpreted.

Examining the EEA faculty meeting minutes as discourse presents unique problems as they are constrained by form, objectivity and an emphasis on parliamentary procedure. They are events recorded by one person and represent the viewpoint of one person. When circulated as a fair representation of a historical event, they become more of a rhetorical enterprise centered on

persuasion (Brown, 1987; Brown, 1992a; Brown, 1992b). In order to examine these texts as social discourse, I also rely on Pierre Bourdieu's concept of authorized language.

Bourdieu suggests that the power of authorized language lies in the delegated power of the spokesperson (Bourdieu, 1991). In other words, the authority of the university is delegated to the departmental texts because the are a *product* of the institution. The substance of discourse is a guarantee of delegation by the way it represents the authority of the establishment. Its power is limited only to the extent of delegation and the social positioning of the spokesperson. The stylistic features which characterize authorized language — such as routinization, stereotyping and neutralization — all stem from the position the spokesperson occupies in the competitive field of the institution. The structure of the field governs the form of expression and access to the text. Bourdieu uses the term "structural censorship" to signify how the authorized spokesperson is subjected to the norms of official protocol when reporting events. Text is actually the product of a dialectical compromise between the expressive interest of the spokesperson and the structural censorship of the field.

The EEA faculty meeting minutes are generally kept by a department secretary and are reviewed by the EEA chair prior to being sent out to the faculty. Following standard "note taking " techniques, certain events are recorded and others left out. Unless the event can be recorded in "acceptable" form, it will go unstated in the minutes. This represents the authority of the institution and the power of the EEA to regulate the "official" minutes. The minutes are a physical manifestation of the compromise between what was actually said during the meeting and what was recorded by the note-taker. The structural censorship of the institution is visible in what the note-taker writes and what is published and circulated after the meeting. Using Bourdieu's notion of authorized language the texts can be examined for a better understanding of university/state relationship during the creation of the PK3 program. This differs from textual narcissism because an emphasis is put on the relationships of the text within the context of the university instead of trying to find "truth" or "reality" in the *correct* reading of the text.

The purpose of this study is to explore the university/state relationship during a "reform" process. To gain a clear understanding of the university/state relationship during the creation of the PK3 program, distinctions must be made about what constitutes the state and what constitutes the relationship between the state and the university.[2] The next section will explore ways to conceptualize the university/state relationship in terms of rule, governance and systems and take a deeper look at the the state, its construction and rule as governmentality. Following this, a methodology of examining the uiveristy/state relationship as a problematics of government will be outlined to provide a framework for the textual analysis.

UNIVERSITY/STATE RELATIONSHIP

Rule, Governance and Systems

To understand the relationship between the university and the state it is important to draw attention to state governments as political structures and their support of colleges and universitites. Like UW-Madison, most colleges and universities classified as public institutions of higher education have been created by state government constituions or laws. Larger universities are often given legal status of bodies politic and corporate and generally function as public institutions drawing financial support from various sources (Millett, 1981). However, ultimate control of financial and policy decision making is generally held by the state.[3] This causes an interdependence that should not be overlooked. the university/state relationship is a critical one but quite daunting due to its structural complexity.

The study of the university/state relationship has come fairly recently to higher education policy researchers. One of the difficulties of this type of analysis is the almost overwhelming array of structures, governance traditions, and processes for policy formations between institutions and state governments. Many higher education research methodologies rely heavily on an empirical/analytical approach. Besides general analyses of university structure and reform, there are several prevailing methods used to study the university/state relationship specifically. These include the political, sociological and policy approaches.

The political approach generally relies on separate case descriptions to examine the structure and power of the relationship to the degree and hierarchy and extent of unity or cohesion in university decision-making (Van de Graaff, Clark, Furth, Goldschmidt & Wheeler, 1978). This is a kind of group-analysis where persons of similar interest are linked together and examined against other groups with competing needs. In this model, group interest is used as a conceptual framework. To apply this to the examination of the PK3 program construction, one would look at the faculty as being a cohesive group and the state (probably epitomized by DPI) as another group. Each group's needs would be analyzed and measured for their power base and structural cohesiveness.

Another method of examination used in higher education is a sociological focus on interorganizations (Crosson, 1991). An interorganizational approach attempts to characterize the behavior, relations, and properties of a collection of organizations seen as a whole. Properties examined include power, conflict, cooperation, and economic unity. Applying this to the PK3 program development, one would look at the faculty/DPI relationship as part of a whole working towards a goal—the reform of the early childhood program in the state. Interorganizational theory attempts to conceptualize networks that actually constitute the university/state organization in totality.

A third type of examination common in higher education research that attempts to study the university/state relationship is the use of systems and policy models. This type of analysis applies analytical constructs for abstracting and depicting major components and relationships. Models are created that attempt to clarify the complexities and include the behavioral and political variables in the decision-making process. The study of policy systems is generally conceived as a study of politics and the political process between the academy and governmental institutions. Politics are seen as patterns of interactions or "systems of power" that interact or conflict over values, interests and goals. Systems theorists are concerned with the search for universal principles and paradigms to explain the behavior of systems or to predict and assist the decision making problems of complex systems (see e.g.Cerych, 1984; Clark, 1983; Crosson, 1991; Van de Graaff et al., 1978; Wildavsky, 1979). A systems analysis of the university/state relationship would try to identify specific variables that would predict how entities (such as DPI and the UW faculty) would act in particular situations. This type of analysis is similar to that used by Prestine in her earlier examination of the UW-Madison and DPI relationship during the creation of the PI4 document (Prestine, 1988).

One problem with all of these methodologies is that they fail to adequately express the complexities of political power *within* the state. The language of political philosophy in the use of oppositional analyses such as these (e.g. state vs. civil society, freedom vs. constraint, sovereignty vs. democracy, public vs. private) helps to conceptually organize "modern" political power, but such an organization fails to express the complexities of each political entity. First, it is difficult to see the differences between the various groups in the political approach. Looking at groups only in competition neglects their interdependence. Some of the faculty and staff under examination may not be in conflict with the state while others are. Second, the interorganizational approach assumes that behavior and relationships can be neatly summarized. It doesn't adequately express the way power circulates within the faculty. It assumes that all behavior mirrors defined actions of some type. Third, the policy approach also tries to identify universal systems and networks of power that can be applied to situations unilaterally without regard for the differences in each decision. It is the predictive emphasis of this approach that makes it problematic. It assumes that given the same situation in the future, the faculty and state will act similarly.

In other words, information can be gleaned from group, interorganization, and systems analyses that present a relationship between the university and the state. However, these models cannot provide the intellectual tools for analyzing the complexities of government in the present. The state has become a complex array of overlapping public and private associations that formulate policy, exercise regulatory authority and assist in the social control of the university from a variety of independent institutional centers (Barrow, 1990). Political power is exercised today through a profusion of shifting alliances between diverse authorities in projects to govern a multitude of

facets of economic activity, social life and individual conduct. I will now outline an alternative way of thinking about the exercise of political power that addresses these concerns as well as others.

Conceptualizing the State

Today's State is a complex mixture of diverse political entities that govern in a multitude of ways. Often the language used to structure oppositions between the state and civil society, in an attempt to get a "fix" on the way the state governs, does not adequately characterize the diverse ways in which rule is exercised. Positioning the State in opposition to the university doesn't recognize the ways in which the university is bound to the State in terms of funding, certification and governance. Seen from this perspective the university is actually part of the system of State government. To speak of the "power" of the State or department (such as DPI) actually minimizes the way in which its power arises from an assemblage of forces. An alternative to this view would see the power of the State as the ability to create citizens capable of bearing a kind of regulated freedom. The State (or DPI) uses its power to create a situation where the university has the freedom to create a program, but it must do so in the way that DPI stipulates. The university is still "free" to put any type of program together, but DPI regulates this freedom through licensure.

This view of State-as-government positions power as an entity onto itself. The State has the power to "do" or to "create" as it wishes. Another option would be to see the power of the state as a multifocal grouping of forces. This is not to say that the state does not exist. We can speak of the power of the state, which actually does exist, but the state itself is not a defined entity. It can be conceptualized as an assemblage of forces by which particular objectives and injunctions can shape the actions of others. In other words, the "center" of the state is multiple. Instead of examining how the power of the state affects those being governed (such as the university), one examines the devices and mentalities that enable various locales to *act* as center.

For instance, one way that government creates centers is through legislation. Imposing a regime of licensure empowers certain bodies to regulate those who seek to act in a "professional" way, both legitimating and regulating them simultaneously. By enacting legislation (such as those that determined the PI4 rules) the power of the state can be seen as a mechanism which served to empower certain agents or entities (such as DPI). In addition, legislation acts as a determiner of how the power will be deployed (such as through the PI4 rules). Programs and strategies formulated at the center may lead to attempts to establish regulatory or negotiating bodies, and may lead to more or less autonomy being granted to other aspects of the bureaucratic web of government. Autonomy is not viewed as the antithesis of political power because individuals can play a large role in the exercise of power as well. A clean line cannot be drawn between "the powerful" and "the powerless."

These two conceptions of "the state" makes discussion of the university/state somewhat difficult. I will refer to the State (capitalized) as meaning State government in Wisconsin. By State government, I generally refer to the particular apparatuses of governing such as the legislature and DPI. In this sense the power of the "State" refers to the actual objects that were put in place to govern the university. I will refer to the state (non-capitalized) as pertaining to the power of the state, what I have described above as the multifocal grouping of forces that circulate within the university. In this way, the power of the state can be made visible in the actions of DPI as well as the faculty in the text. This dual conception can be seen in the creation of the PI4 document outlined a new certification program. In some ways the university was subjected to this act of power by DPI (i.e. the State). In other ways the university was part of the power of the state through the creation of the PK3 program.

Governmentality

To frame the examination of the university/state relationship in a way that draws attention to the power relationships within, I will utilize Foucault's notion of *governmentality*. Governmentality can be conceptualized as a way of understanding the strategies used to govern (Foucault, 1979b). It is a mentality of rule—a way of problematizing the way political rule intervenes upon the conduct of knowledge and people. Instead of deploying power over society (sovereign rule) governmentality is a way of thinking about the utilization of power *within* society. It is a way to study the "governmentalization" of the state instead of the State domination of society. Using this concept, the university/state relationship would be understood as the way the state uses its power to act through the university apparatus. The university would also be scrutinized for how it uses power to affect the State—and neither the "university" nor the "State" would be understood in isolation, but rather through the circulation of power. The text could then be examined for evidence of political rationalizations and technologies of rule—what Rose and Miller call the "problematics of government" (Rose & Miller, 1992).

Political Rationalities

Governmentality is a way of conceptualizing the institutions, procedures, analyses, calculations and tactics that allow the use of power to govern.[4] One way to make this visible in the text is to examine it for the *rationalities* that order governmental rule. While still acknowledging their interconnectedness, the search for political rationalities looks for the ways the state and university use power in relation to each other. Political rationalities are visible when institutions of authority (such as DPI and UW-Madison) base their rule on what is accepted as proper (or moral) or just. This also includes a conception of what is being governed. For instance, DPI may justify its creation of the PI4 rules and regulations on the basis that they have always had the authority to

determine certification standards in the state and they are the best institution to do so. The rationalization of rule is based on the way the power to rule is *thought* about.

Examining text for evidence of political rationalities can be difficult because there isn't a way to measure the degree of rationality in practice. Instead, it is more meaningful to examine how rationalities *become* part of practice. Foucault describes it as follows:

> "One isn't assessing things in terms of an absolute against which they could be evaluated as consisting more or less perfect forms of rationality, but rather examining how forms of rationality inscribe themselves in practices or systems of practices, and what role they play within them, because it's true that 'practices' don't exist without a certain regime of rationality" (Foucault, 1991b, p. 79).

Foucault goes on to suggest that one should analyze rationality for how it forms an ensemble of rules and procedures and for how it determines a domain of subjects. This can be thought of as the moral or epistemological character of rationality.

The moral or epistemological character of rationality is the way in which the power to rule is attributed as a "proper" or "just" duty for the authority. The epistemological character can be seen in two ways. First, rule or action is based on some kind of ideal or *principle*. For instance, the language of the text might position the faculty as trying to persuade DPI to change a ruling because it caused undue hardships for students in the program. The reason for the faculty's action is based in the principle that they should look out for the interests and needs of the students, and it is for this reason that DPI should change. Second, the epistemological or moral character of rationality embodies some *conception* of the person over whom government is exercised. There is an understanding of the nature of the subjects being governed. An example of this would be looking at the text for the ways in which the faculty perceived how well DPI understood their program. The textual analysis would look for comments about what DPI said and how rational their conceptions of the elementary program appeared to the faculty.

In looking for the principles and conceptions of political rationalities in the text it is important to recognize that they are not general laws or rules which have been rediscovered through historical interpretation. It would be inappropriate to say that the faculty acted only in principle when they position DPI rulings as a burden to students. The conceptions and principles that make political rationalities visible are complex and involve a large variety of interactions from within the group. Returning to Foucault:

> "We are dealing with sets of calculated, reasoned prescriptions in terms of which institutions are meant to be reorganized, spaces arranged, and behaviours regulated. If they have an identity, it is that of a programming left in abeyance, not that of a general but hidden meaning" (Foucault, 1991b, p. 80).

In other words, examining the text for the political rationalities of DPI and the faculty situates them as part of a whole *technology* of regulations. The morality or principle of actions (such as acting on behalf of the students) needs to be seen as more than ideology. The action signified a

discursive mediation which allowed a whole range of technologies to be brought to bear on the social behavior. The archived minutes and memos can be seen as an action (or technology) that was meant to persuade the faculty (and frequently, DPI) into changing their behavior.

Analyzing the text for the principle behind the political rationalities (or their moral character) signals ties to a larger technological apparatus. The same can be said for analyzing the text for the conceptions of the political rationalities (or their epistemological character). Knowledge of what was being governed as measured against what is known as "true" gives clues to the "hidden" technologies of government rule. The text signals the discursive relations between the university and State. This relationship in the text opens up a space to "see" the technologies of rule within the political rationalities of the state.

Political Technologies

A second way to visualize governmentality in the text is to look for the *technologies* of government. It is through technologies that the political rationalities become deployable. In other words, the technologies are the actual things used in the governing process. These include the calculations, techniques, apparatuses and procedures through which authorities seek to embody and give effect to governmental ambitions. In studying the university/state relationship, the technologies of government would include the methods of management used by both DPI and the university. For instance, when the new PI4 rules were given to the faculty, they cam with a newly-created faculty advising worksheet to assist them in helping students through the new maze of regulations. This was a technology used to govern the way in which information was disseminated to students in an orderly and accurate way.

Foucault discusses the technologies of government as emerging during the Classical Age with the beginning of a populational economy. For the first time in history, scientific categories (rather than juridical) were used to understand the population being governed.[5] With this new understanding came a need for a new type of discipline:

> "...clearly its modes of organization, all the institutions with within which it had developed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries - schools, manufactories, armies, etc. - all this can only be understood on the basis of the development of the great administrative monarchies, but nevertheless, discipline was never more important or more valorized than at the moment when it became important to manage a population" (Foucault, 1991a, p. 102).[6]

One way to think about political technologies as the relate to governmentality is consider how they enable the management of populations. Political technologies develop a "mode of understanding aimed at particulars" (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983, p. 134). After the eighteenth century this newer form of government described by Foucault aimed to produce a population of human beings that could be treated as productive, "docile bodies" (Foucault, 1979a). Instead of

sovereign rule, new techniques were created that depended upon amassing knowledge about the population, and which rendered it calculable by turning it into inscriptions that were "durable and transportable, that could be accumulated in the offices of officials, that could be added, subtracted, compared, and contrasted" (Rose, 1989). One form of political technology is documentation. For instance the faculty documentation of PI4 compliance can be thought of as a political technology that disciplined the faculty.

It is important to remember, however, what is meant by "discipline" in this analogy. It is not chastisement or punishment of the faculty by DPI. Discipline, from this perspective, is a specific technique of power that regards individuals both as objects and instruments of its exercise. Political technologies operate differentially and precisely on bodies (or those being governed) through a combination of hierarchical observation and the kinds of "micro-penalties" in which more and more areas of life become accessible to power—what Foucault terms normalizing judgment (Foucault, 1979a). By requiring the documentation of PI4 regulations on course syllabi, DPI was able to observe how closely aligned the courses were to the new rules. Documentation was a form of surveillance which allowed the state to "know" the university as a subject or docile body. The texts can be examined for evidence of this type of observational documentation.

Again drawing from Foucault, this fascination with detail has historical significance. In times of sovereign rule, the minutiae of everyday life had escaped the governmental gaze. With the emergence of governmentality, however, surveillance and observation of the population as individuals became more important. A vast, meticulous documentary apparatus becomes an essential component of governmental power. The accumulation of individual documentation made possible:

> "the measurement of overall phenomena, the description of groups, the characterization of collective facts, the calculation of gaps between individuals, their distribution in a given population (Foucault, 1979a, p. 190).

Many forms of documentation were required by DPI with the passage of PI4. Each can be viewed as a form of political technology that helped the state know and "watch over" the program.

Another way that political technologies utilize hierarchical observation and normalizing judgment he examination. Foucault refers to the examination as a space where:

> "...disciplinary power manifests its potency, essentially, by arranging objects. The examination is, as it were, the ceremony of this objectification" (Foucault, 1979a, p. 187).

The Elementary Education program at UW-Madison was examined by DPI through at least two program reviews between 1982 and 1992. Positioned within the philosophy of governmentality, the program review can be thought of as the epitome of surveillance and normalizing judgment needed to discipline the "body" of the faculty. DPI got to see whether the program was in

compliance with the political technologies (rules) they had legislated. In other words, the power of the state to watch over and govern the teacher education program manifested itself in a political technology of program review, or examination.

Studying the Text

Using the idea of governmentality as a basis, the text will be analyzed as a problematics of government between the university and the state. The political rationalities, and technologies of rule will be explored using the following questions:

1) How is the relationship between the university and the state made visible in terms of political rationalities?

2) What governmental technologies of DPI and the university are visible in the text during the construction of the program and how are each discussed?

TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

I. How is the relationship between the university and state made visible in terms of political rationalities?

Principle

As discussed earlier, one one way to conceptualize the institutions, procedures, analysis, calculations and tactics of the program is through governmentality. Political rationalities refer to the morals or principles behind the ruling. The analysis of the text for evidence of political rationalities — both DPI's and the faculty's — leads to an examination of the subtleties of language used to describe each entity. Neither DPI nor the faculty mention their authoritative basis outright in the text. However, as discussed in chapter one, examining "official" text as one of governmentality scrutinizes the relations of power and knowledge. Knowledge is examined for its normalcy or naturalness and who is articulating it. By looking at how DPI is positioned in the minutes, one can discern how pedagogical issues were linked with the political rationalities of the state.

In the minutes, the changes proposed by DPI were variously referred to as "rulings," "requirements," "initiatives," "mandates," and "rules." This gives an indication as to the extent of governing taking place, but it does not explore the concrete governing of the program through its pedagogical strategies. To investigate the political rationality of government, the text is examined as artifacts of a mental machinery that renders the reality of government thinkable. As discussed in chapter two, one way to do this is to analyze the rules of rationality or reason in the text for its

moral and epistemological character. The moral or epistemological character of political rationalities can be conceived as the way in which the power to rule is attributed as a "proper" or "just" duty for the authority. Often, the epistemological character is based in some kind of principle.

For instance, one of the first required programmatic changes during the ten-year span of time under scrutiny was the addition of credits in creative and performing arts for students in the program. One faculty member circulated a memo that stated in part:

> "...We want to keep the burden of new state requirements off the students as much as possible and alleviate their scheduling problems..." (Call to meeting attachment in the form of a memo to Elementary Area Staff dated 10/31/86).

Because the new state regulations did not mandate the creation of a new program (the students were only to take more courses), no programmatic changes were particularly necessary. Instead, the text indicates a call to action based in *principle*. The faculty is being asked to act on behalf of the students and against the new regulations. The memo continues:

> "Using this plan the burden is placed solely on the students, along with increased tuition, costs of books and supplies and living expenses. The usual student, unless endowed with a wealthy parent, finishes the teacher preparation program burdened with onerous debts and a low salary. The almost certain requirements for an "induction year" being imposed by the DPI will add to this burden. I am trying to hold the program to nine semesters" (Call to meeting attachment in the form of a memo to Elementary Area Staff dated 10/31/86).

The new regulation was positioned against a principle that the students' needs should be considered when changing the program. The DPI requirements are described as being a "burden" to the students. The new requirement is positioned in the text as being wrong in principle and the faculty is being persuaded to "do the right thing" by not allowing this to happen.

The state's political rationality governs the willingness to act — to "hold the program to nine semesters." Another example of action based in principle is recognized during the discussion of the bulging enrollment in the minutes:

> "...enrollment cuts are necessary because DPI initiatives must be funded out of our current budget and TA workloads need to be reduced" (Minutes of special meeting held on 2/27/89)

In this example the new initiatives are positioned as causing economic hardships that will indirectly increase TA workloads. The text positions the faculty as being rooted in the principle that they should act in the best interest of the TA's instead of the students, by reducing the number of students in the program.

One way to look at the overt principles that were positioned in the text is to examine the persuasiveness of the actions taken. In the first example, the principle behind the persuasive action can be thought of as "we need to consider the undergraduates when we make decisions." The

university was positioned as acting against the programmatic changes stipulated by DPI and recorded in the text. The memo is an attempt to persuade the faculty members to make a decision while remembering the students' needs (the moral principle) in relation to the actions of DPI. In the second example, the principle behind the persuasive action can be thought of as "we need to act in the best interests of our TA's." Here the faculty is positioned in the text as discussing the need for enrollment cuts as a way to reduce TA workloads brought about by reduced funding. In both examples, the political rationality behind the persuasive action was in response to an act of governing by DPI. This is visible in the text through the moral principles behind the action — such as acting on behalf of undergraduates and TA's.

Conception of Rule

A second way to examine the text in relation to the political rationalities of governmentality is to look at how the epistemological character of the text embodies some conception of the person over who government is exercised. As discussed EARLIER, this could include a group to be led, a population to be managed, a resource to be exploited, etc. One way that this becomes visible in the text is through a closer examination of how the faculty was "asked" to respond to DPI rulings. Sometimes the faculty was persuasively positioned in the text to network outside of the department:

> "(Chair)[7] reported on developments related to DPI's proposed certification rules, discussed their impact on the elementary program and encouraged those at the meeting to contact and inform their non-university public school colleagues of the aspects of the rules so that they might express their own opinions about the certification recommendations" (Minutes of 10/14/85).

This persuasive tactic was also encouraged when DPI began to require certifiable minors in the teacher education program:

> "It was suggested that if faculty have reactions to the minors guidelines that were distributed they should talk to their colleagues around the state and submit responses to DPI as soon as possible" (Minutes of 5/8/89).

In other instances the faculty created Ad Hoc committees to develop responses to DPI rulings as in these examples:

> "...an Ad hoc committee be set up to develop an appropriate response to the effect of current DPI requirements on minority enrollments" (Minutes of 5/9/88)

> "...that the chair of the elementary education appoint an Ad Hoc committee representing elementary education faculty in mathematics, science and social studies to develop a response to the new DPI rules concerning the aforementioned requirement" (Minutes of 5/12/92)

> "A group of faculty met on Thursday morning, May 14 to develop a response to (the) request" (minutes 5/12/92)

Or, the EEA chair would write a response and then ask for faculty feedback:

> "It was suggested that (Chair) prepare a statement against this change and supporting the continuing of the Adolescent Psychology option" (Minutes of 4/9/84).

> "A summary of responses to these rules has been prepared and is being sent to the elementary staff separately for review and comment" (Minutes, 3/10/86)

In each of these instances is the faculty *action* represented in the text can be examined in relationship to the governing by the State. In each case the action is created to heighten awareness of the program in the eyes of DPI, either through networking, formal committee responses, or formal responses by the EEA chair. The textual examination suggests that the faculty was positioned in disagreement with DPI's *conception* of their program. This conception or understanding can be thought of as the faculty's comprehension of DPI's political rationality regarding their program.

To clarify, the text positions DPI as not fully understanding the program (and those being governed) and it was up to the faculty to increase DPI's awareness on several fronts by networking and writing formal responses to DPI's rulings. Another interpretation could be that DPI wanted to change parts of the program that the faculty believed were integral. In either case the faculty *could* have done nothing about the changes and adjusted the program accordingly. Instead, they appear in the text as acting from within their own form of political rationality to network and write formal responses to the rulings.

The analysis of faculty reactions to DPI rulings in the text provides clues to the epistemological character of the political rationalities of both the faculty and DPI. As discussed in chapter two, governmentality is a way of conceptualizing the institutions, procedures, analyses, calculations and tactics that allow the use of power to govern. Political rationalities order governmental rule and are visible in the ways the university and state use power in relation to each other. The persuasive faculty action represented in the text (networking, writing responses, etc.) is examined in relationship to the state governing. The various actions are designed to heighten the state's awareness of the program. The epistemological character of the action signals an underlying principle of mis(non)understanding of the program on behalf of the state. This political rationality includes a conception of what and who is being governed.

II. What political technologies of DPI and the University are visible in the text during the construction of the PK3 program and how are each discussed?

Documentation

As discussed earlier, the political technologies of government can be thought of as the strategies, techniques and procedures through which different forces operate that enable connections between the aspirations of the authorities and the activities of individuals and groups (Rose & Miller, 1992). Technologies are mechanisms that allow the deployment of political rationalities. One way they are visible in the text is through a reliance on documentation. In early 1988 the minutes state:

> "...the Department of Public Instruction may require that they be provided with documentation that our lecturers and supervisors have been made aware of those certification requirements specific to each course" (Call to meeting of 3/7/88).

The minutes report that a discussion of this regulation and possible documentation requirement by DPI. Rather than document how each individual instructor and supervisor would be made aware of the new requirements, the following policy statement was written and agreed upon at an EEA meeting:

> "The Faculty of each of the professional methods courses and practicums will meet at least once early in each academic year to discuss the content and experiences to be included in each course. All supervisors and lecturers will be included in these meetings. Provision for instruction in those certification requirements specific to each course will be examined at these meetings" (Policy statement attached to meeting minutes of 3/7/88)

In this example the faculty was recorded in the text as responding to the imposed political technology by DPI that they *document* instructor knowledge of the rules. The creation of the new policy statement by the faculty can be thought of as a response to the technologies imposed by DPI and at the same time amplifies the political technology. The call for documentation was answered with documentation. The documented policy statement would serve (at least figuratively) to guarantee all teaching faculty had been made aware of the new rules.

The increased documentation was evident in the examination of rewrites of course syllabi to explicitly detail course coverage of new rules and regulations. This was significant for students as well as faculty. After the adoption of PI4, the minutes frequently refer to the confusion over which rules were being covered by existing program and which were not. The documentation of DPI rules began in 1987:

> "After discussion it was agreed that the following documentation should be made available by instructors: a) a list of the DPI standards addressed in the course and b) a core curriculum or core syllabus for each course with the topics or objectives keyed to the DPI standards. Core syllabi were deemed particularly important for courses with multiple sections" (Meeting minutes of 3/9/87)

Although it was requested that all faculty provide documented syllabi there appears to have been some resistance to doing so. Two months later the minutes reported:

> "(Professor 1) reported that she has received materials from only a few instructors concerning course content to meet the new DPI Standards. After discussion it was agreed that each instructor whose course content meets certain aspects of the new DPI Standards turn in the following to (Professor 1) by May 21, 1987: a) a sheet listing the DPI Code Point Content for each course and b) a syllabus for each course keyed to specific code points" (Meeting minutes of 5/11/87).

Later, there appeared to be some confusion about whether *all* syllabi had to have recorded standards:

> "...(Professor 1) inquired as to whether syllabi distributed to students need to have DPI standards the course meets listed on the syllabus. (Professor 2) replied that he believed only the syllabi on file in the elementary office need to have the DPI standards listed on them. A check of previous minutes verified this interpretation" (Minutes of the 10/12/87 meeting).

The faculty appear in the text as resisting the documentation of DPI standards on course syllabi. One way to think about this is to view their resistance as part of the power relations circulating in the EEA. Power relationships, such as the association between the "rule" of DPI and the production of faculty resistance, are present everywhere in the power network (Foucault, 1990). Power is not something possessed or wielded by powerful agents because it is co-constituted by those who support and resist it (Gutting, 1994, p. 109). The faculty is able to resist the technology of documentation through non-compliance (or compliance resistance), but the act of compliance also makes the ruling power possible.

A similar documentation had to be made in 1991 after new rules required a Human Relations Program via code points in eight content areas:

> "It was the consensus of the faculty that the elementary areas should meet and document code points by course as soon as possible... Documentation is required to be up to date every other year" (Meeting minutes of 2/11/91).

Governmentality is dependent upon knowledge of the subject of rule. The documentation of PI4 compliance that the faculty compiled was the result of a new political technology of the state. The documentation can be thought of as a new technique that helped the state to amass information about the faculty. In turn, the faculty sought compliance with DPI regulations and "disciplined" itself by documentation the PI4 code points.[8] These political technologies, such as documentation of rules on course syllabi or Human Relation Code Points, help the state to "know" those being governed as something calculable and easy to discipline. From a Foucauldian perspective, the documentation can be thought of as a form of discipline that helped to create a productive "docile body" of the program and faculty.

Positioned as an issue of governmentality, the disciplinary techniques which operated within the EEA culminated in an examination — the DPI program review. After the 1989 program review by DPI, the following appears in the minutes:

> "The DPI mandates that did not explicitly appear on syllabi as being covered in a specific course were the ones that were questioned by the DPI reviewer...the department will also need to come up with a way to document school visits by professors who teach methods courses and in the future student teaching supervisors will need to have had three years of teaching experience" (Meeting minutes of 5/8/89).

The DPI review or examination can be thought of as a form of *surveillance*. Surveillance enables disciplinary power to become part of an integrated system. Although surveillance is organized as a multiple and anonymous power, its power rests on individuals (Foucault, 1979a, p 176). Surveillance is often manifested in the creation or extension of rituals, such as the proliferating practices of examination or confession. The reference to the documentation "that did not explicitly appear on the syllabi" encompassed the way in which the state examined the university. The state wanted to see how UW-Madison was complying with the rules they had defined. The faculty was expected to comply (confess) on their syllabi, how the new mandates were being met. Foucault discusses the confession as being one of most highly valued techniques for producing truth in society (Foucault, 1990, p. 59).[9] When DPI had first asked for the documentation of mandates on syllabi, the minutes chronicle discussion by the faculty about which of the mandates would be covered by courses outside of the department (such as through Educational Policy Studies and Educational Psychology) and therefore did not need to appear on the syllabi. Because some of the required courses for DPI certification were taught outside of the department, not all requirements were noted on the reviewed syllabi, and DPI noted this in their report.

The program review (examination) was the epitome of the surveillance needed to discipline and objectify the "body" of the faculty and program. The state got to see whether the program was in compliance with the disciplinary techniques (rules) they had legislated. Namely, the power of the state to watch over and govern the teacher education program manifested itself through documentation. As with the code point authentication on course syllabi, the program review was a form of surveillance which allowed the state to "know" the university as a subject or docile body. The examination (or program review) conducted by the state served to "objectify" the faculty by making them an individual body to be acted upon through additional forms of documentation and surveillance.

Also key to this statement is that even *more* documentation would be required in the future to demonstrate that methods instructors were visiting the school and all supervisors had at least

three years of classroom teaching experience. It is explicit by the statement "the department will also need to come up with a way to document school visits..."

The faculty also passed forms of documentation required by the state through to the undergraduates. For instance, PI4 stipulated that students in elementary education had to have experience working with ethnic minority and low-income groups. A policy statement was written and included in a memo given to the faculty as part of a new advising worksheet. On the top of the statement (written in a format to be handed out directly to students) was a copy of the DPI rule:

> (DPI CODE - PI 4.14) "The program shall require a minimum of 50 documented clock hours of direct involvement with adult and pupil members of a group whose background the student does not share including at least one of the following designated ethnic minority groups: African-Americans, American Indians, Asian-Americans, Pacific-Islander-Americans and foreign born persons of color; and various socioeconomic groups including low income. At least 25 of the 50 clock hours of direct involvement shall be with representatives of one or more of the designated ethnic minority groups..." (Attachment to advising worksheet given to faculty 10/3/86).

The 50 hours Human Relations Field Experience had to be completed over an 8-week period of time and students had to establish a "one-to-one, ongoing relationship with an individual or members of a small group." Additionally, the experience had to occur in an instructional setting with pupil learners. The sheet warned students of the potential problems of not getting fieldwork accepted:

> "SUGGESTION: It is a frustrating experience to discover after the fact that the field-work you have just completed won't count for human relations credit. Consequently, you are strongly advised to obtain, submit, and have your Human Relations Field Experiences Application approved by a member of the human relations staff before doing the experience" (Attachment to advising worksheet given to faculty 10/3/86).

This technology of documentation was "required" by DPI. The faculty "required" students to submit documentation of completion. There was a specific procedure the students had to follow to document their experiences. It involved several steps which had to be documented and submitted for approval and verification:

> The procedure for completing the Human Relations Field Experience Requirement is as follows:
>
> 1. Obtain a Field Experience Application from the Human Relations Office, 109 Education Building. Speak with a member of the Human Relations staff to ensure that the experience you are planning is appropriate.
> 2. Complete the Field Experience Application. Obtain your Field Supervisor's signature when you arrange your experience. The Human Relations staff will send for the supervisor's signature at the end of your experience to verify its completion.
> 3. Have the application approved by a Human Relations staff member (109 Education Building).

4. Attend a two-hour Human Relations Workshop upon completion of your field experience. Sign up in 109 Education. Workshops are offered on a regular basis throughout the school year and students are urged to attend a workshop as soon as possible after completing the experience. Students may attend a workshop anytime after 25 hours of the 50-hour requirement have been completed. Even though you may choose to complete two different experiences of 25 hours each, only one workshop session is required" (Attachment to advising worksheet given to faculty 10/3/86).

At the bottom of the handout, students were again advised of the potential problems of getting fieldwork approved, verified and documented:

> "NOTE: Some courses require doing fieldwork, and other courses offer the option of doing fieldwork. No course-related fieldwork experience is automatically accepted as fulfilling the Human Relations fieldwork requirement. To fulfill the requirement, course-related fieldwork must meet the same criteria as any other non-course-related experience, and the student must submit a Human Relations Field Experience Application form and have it approved by a program staff member according to the procedures outlined above" (Attachment to advising worksheet given to faculty 10/3/86).

Several things are interesting about the way the Human Relations Fieldwork is positioned in the text if we think about these rules as part of the technology of governmentality. First, the experiences are listed as being a *state* requirement and not something that the university was requiring. This is evident in the way the PI4 code is quoted at the top of the handout. Second, and related to the first, is the hierarchical construction of the documentation. The "power" to determine whether an experience meets the criteria outlined by the state is maintained by the counselors in the Human Relations Office. Students must also get supervisory signatures at the start and end of their experience. The Human Relations Field Experience documentation can be thought of as a form of surveillance which allowed the university (and state) to "know" the student as a subject or docile body. The student had to conform and discipline their "self" to meet the requirements.

At first glance, the power structures in both of these examples appear to be traditional and top-down —the PI4 requirements come from the state (not the university) and the determiner of "counting" field experience was in the hands of the Human Relations Office. However, both of these examples can be explained in an alternative way if one thinks of them in terms of governmentality or "the government of the self by the self in its articulation with relations to others" (Davidson, 1994). Foucault has said that "modern" governmental rationality is simultaneously about individualizing and totalizing. While the state requirement appears totalizing, it is at the same time individualizing in that every student must document their human relations work, thereby becoming move visible and known. While the individual is understood, he or she also becomes part of a society or population of individuals to be governed. "The student" is part of a grouping of people completing teacher certification requirements.

Third, the types of experiences are clearly identified. The field experiences are nested in an populational construction because students must work with specific groups defined by a

classificatory norm. The students must work in multicultural settings, with ethnic minorities or with low-income students. Other distinctions, such as gender and persons with disabilities are not mentioned. The distinctions that are made in the text about the types of persons the student is to work with defines certain regulatory categories can be seen as populational reasoning and as part of a political technology with a particular history.

Historical location of racial classifications: Many of the "modern" categories used to think about people were initially put into place to collect numerical data (Hacking, 1991). With the advent of census taking in the early 1800's came new ways to classify and count people. "Official" statistical structures were created and bureaucratized into demographic "meta-concepts" such as race and socio-economic status. The population, when grouped statistically, could be compared to a hypothetical 'norm.' Similar to the earlier discussion of psychology and expertise, the classification of people is a political technology that serves to *normalize* the population. Normalizing technologies operate by establishing a common definition of goals and procedures which are often agreed-upon examples of how a "well-ordered" domain of human activity should be organized (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983, p. 198). These classifications define what is normal and what falls outside of normal — often known as 'other.' Racial and social classifications produce identities which are historically structured and interact through multiple social relations.

The reference to "designated ethnic minority groups" in the DPI code can be linked historically to an emerging social topography in the 1960's which centered upon the growth of the American population, its concentration in large cities, and the racial and class distribution within these cities (Rose, 1989). At this time, social scientists investigating urban areas began to find regular patterns of ethnic groupings in ghetto districts, a surrounding ring of white working-class families and the bulk of the middle-class white population distributed in the outer suburbs. Political concerns centered on the social and economic inequality amounting to racial segregation in the large cities. With this realization came pressure to change teacher education courses to encourage sensitivity to cultural and racial differences among children. Multi-cultural and ethnic related pedagogies were introduced in teacher education programs to "correct" inequalities in society (Popkewitz, 1993; Popkewitz & Pereyra, 1993).

These efforts also introduced new patterns of regulations, as the linguistic distinctions made in the text also organize what is spoken about and how that speech is expected to occur. The veneration of certain groupings in society sets in motion decided ways of discerning problems, solutions and patterns by which progress and failure are to be judged. Stating that the student must have direct involvement with groups of people "whose background the student does not share" also posits the groups as "other." Students in the program would complete Human Relations Fieldwork with the (DPI-defined) "designated ethnic minority groups." Through the enunciation of racial and social categories a form of cultural authority is articulated in the curriculum (Donald,

1992). The cultural "other" becomes something to be classified and understood in relation to privileged norms that are presumed to make the canon of school subjects accessible. Although created with the admirable purpose of helping new teachers understand children with backgrounds different from their own, the program also constructed the child in relationship to other members of a population. Individuality was replaced with normativity.

Structure and Time

Political technologies, however, were not only constructed in DPI, but also through the rules and regulations of the university program itself. For example, the text describes various advising "worksheets" given to the faculty to help them interpret the changes as they affected students in the program. In 1988 two versions of the April 11 meeting minutes were published. The first version was distributed to faculty and then returned to the Chair for revision at the May 9, 1988 meeting. The original version was catalogued in the notebooks with "THIS IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY" typed across the top. The second version of the minutes had a great deal of the more "personal" comments edited out. For instance:

> "(Professor 1) presented the worksheet for the new elementary program to the elementary faculty and discussion centered around the various items within the worksheet. (Professor 2) questioned the inclusion of Latin-American history in the "Non-Western History" category. *Since the Liberal Studies requirement is an Education School general studies requirement, that issue would need to be forwarded to the appropriate committee at that level. The worksheet reflects what has been approved; it does not reflect our own approval*" (Meeting minutes of 4/11/88, italicized writing edited out of final version.)

At least two things are distinguishable in this part of the text. First, it hints at the complexities of the changes that were taking place within the EEA. The new program required new knowledge that had to be conveyed to the faculty. The worksheet structured this knowledge in a way so "accurate" information would be given to the students. Second, the "disclaimer" about the worksheet not signifying "acceptance" positions the faculty as not being a part of the changes. They were required to use the new program but they didn't have to approve of it. Another example of the technologies of change within the EEA is highlighted by the following:

> "Advising packets will be distributed to provide answers to all the questions you want to ask about the current state of our program but were afraid to ask your Dean" (Call to meeting on 10/3/86).

The mentioning of advising packets in the text is interesting because of the way in which the packets were frequently modified to reflect the ongoing changes in the program brought on by the new DPI rules. The advising packets can be viewed as a political technology that structures the new knowledges in advising. They represent a kind of "second tier" of political technology.

Instead of being imposed by the state (such as mandatory documentation) the advising worksheets operated within the faculty.

It is not the existence of the worksheets that are important, but the way they are positioned in the text as something of change brought about by DPI. After the packets were distributed, the minutes record:

> "Packets were distributed that should help faculty in advising students on the various changes that are occurring within our program. (Professor 1) presented the various points within the packet and discussion followed" (Meeting minutes of 10/13/86).

The minutes call attention to the changes and structures needed to help students with the revised program.

In addition to the changing worksheets, the transitional structuring and timelines that were addressed in the minutes also give clues to the political techniques at work. There was an urgency in the decision-making process. During a discussion on enrollment restrictions due to decreased funding the following was recorded:

> "(Chair) also said it would not be feasible to make program changes in time for Fall 1985, since this would require DPI authorization which would result in further delays. Failure to reach a decision at this time could result in merely extending present problems for the next year-and-a-half" (Meeting minutes of 10/4/84)

A similar time-linked urgency was related in a handout the following month:

> "(Professor 1) distributed a handout on DPI requirements for new certification alternatives that will go into effect after July 1992. She said the certifications that the elementary area chooses to offer will affect students entering the elementary program in Spring of 1990 and that these new certification programs must be approved by Fall 1989" (Minutes of 11/14/88).

The reference to the new rules is tied with a time-dependent political technology in that the faculty is positioned as having to decide what programs to offer by a specific deadline set by DPI. Not only did the decision have to be made quickly, but the decisions would be affecting students that would soon be admitted to the program. The process of DPI approval took additional time causing a sense of urgency in the minutes.

SUMMARY

By examining the governmentality of the univeristy/state relationship several things became clearer. First, both the university and the state were positioned in the text as acting from a moral or political framework regarding conception of rule. The faculty in particular appeared in the text as acting from within their own form of political rationality to network and write formal responses to state rulings. It was as if they felt they had a right or responsibility to try and argue with the state about certain aspects of the new legislation and how it affected the students in the program. The

epistemological character guiding the persuasive actions was based in morality or principles held by the faculty. For instance, the faculty was documented as acting "on behalf" of the students and TA's in the EEA when they responded to the rulings. The actions which the faculty took when they responded to DPI provided clues to the way they perceived DPI's understanding of their program. The actions were created to heighten awareness of the program in the eyes of DPI, either through networking, formal committee responses, or formal responses by the department chair. The textual examination suggests that the faculty disagreed with DPI's conception of their program. This conception or understanding can be thought of as the faculty's comprehension of DPI's political rationality regarding their program.

Second, the power of the state to watch over and govern the teacher education program manifested itself in a political technology of documentation that was visible in the text. Various types of documentation were required by the state, and the faculty appears in the text as resisting documentation through non-compliance. Again drawing from Foucault, this practice served to "objectify" the faculty by making them an individual body to be acted upon through additional documentation and surveillance, such as through the examination (or regular DPI program review). In a sense, the faculty "disciplined" itself and the program into what DPI wanted. This increase in documentation was often "answered" with additional technologies negotiated by the faculty and "passed on" to the students. Students were soon required to document their work in the community in terms of human relations code points and hand these in for credit to complete the program.

Third, another form of technology was visible through the complexities of changes that were taking place within the EEA structured the way in which information was given to the students. Advising packets were created that provided uniform interpretation of the rules and regulations. Additionally, the transitional structuring and timelines that were addressed in the minutes also showed a time-dependent political technology operating in the EEA. From the viewpoint of governmentality, the very rules for classifying embodied in the DPI regulations were also enbodied in the advising packets. In one sense, when examining the governing process the university/state distinction dissovles.

This dissolution of the university/state dichotomy has many implications for the study of teacher education reform and change. Teacher education reform is generally analyzed as an autocratic "event" caused by forces external to the university and its population. As such, little attention is paid to the ways in which university faculty and students act as part of the changing apparatus of power. For instance, the various forms of documentation and codification which became part of the "new" PK3 teacher education program could be thought of as something the state "did" to the university. However, using a Foucauldian analysis of governmentality, the documentation was thought of as a form of discipline which helped to produce a productive "docile

body" of the program and faculty which often culminated in some form of examination (or program review). Power was productive and worked through multiple points. The university/state dichotomy in light of this dissolves. The faculty and program are understood as being "governed" through their relationships with each other — relations whose strategies govern action and participation. The faculty wanted to "do the right thing" and change their program to meet state guidelines but operated with the same rules of organization as the state.

Foucault's notion of governmentality can be a very useful framework for analyzing teacher education reform and change. Using this concept the university/state relationship is understood as the way in which the state uses its power to act through the university apparatus. The university is also scrutinized for how it uses power to affect the state -- and neither the "university" nor the "state" is understood in isolation, but rather in relation to each other. Aspects of the program that appeared normal or natural were confronted, often becoming "denaturalized" in the process. I believe it is important to explore these "everyday spaces" of teacher education practice. The aim of such exploration is not to discover what we are, but to make probematic the ways we have become, and perhaps refuse some of our own individualization:

> "The conclusion would be that the political, ethical, social, philosophical problem of our days is not to try to liberate the individual from the state, and from the state's institutions, but to liberate us both from the state and the type of individualization which is linked to the state. We have to promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of this kind of individuality which has been imposed on us for several centuries" (Foucault, 1983, p. 216).

REFERENCES

Bachelard, G. (1984). The new scientific spirit (A. Goldhammer, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press. (Original work published 1934).

Baker, S. (1991). Reflection, doubt, and the place of rhetoric in postmodern social theory. Sociological Theory, 232-245.

Baltas, A. (1989). Louis Althusser and Joseph D. Sneed: A strange encounter in philosophy of science? In K. Gavroglu, Y. Goudaroulis, & P. Nicolacopoulos (Eds.), Imre Lakatos and theories of scientific change, (pp. 269-286). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Barrow, C. W. (1990). Universities and the capitalist state: Corporate liberalism and the reconstruction of American higher education, 1894-1928. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bazerman, C. (1992). The interpretation of disciplinary writing. In R. H. Brown (Ed.), Writing the social text: Poetics and politics in social science discourse, (pp. 31-38). New York: Walter DeGryuter, Inc.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). Language and symbolic power (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Brown, R. H. (1987). Reason as rhetorical: On relations among epistemology, discourse and practice. In J. S. Nelson, A. Megill, & D. N. McCloskey (Eds.), The rhetoric of the human sciences: Language and argument in scholarship and public affairs, (pp. 184-197). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Brown, R. H. (1992a). From Suspicion to Affirmation: Postmodernism and the Challenges of Rhetorical Analysis. In R. H. Brown (Ed.), Writing the Social Text: Poetics and Politics in Social Science Discourse, (pp. 219-27). New York: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.

Brown, R. H. (1992b). Poetics, politics, and truth: An invitation to rhetorical analysis. In R. H. Brown (Ed.), Writing the social text: Poetics and politics in social science discourse, (pp. 3-7). New York: Walter deGryuter, Inc.

Cerych, L. (1984). The policy perspective. In B. R. Clark (Ed.), Perspectives on higher education: Eight disciplinary and comparative views, (pp. 233-255). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1990). Reading research [Unpublished Manuscript]: Michigan State University, Dept. of Political Science, East Lansing, MI.

Clark, B. R. (1983). The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cocks, J. (1989). The oppositional imagination: Feminism, critique and political theory. New York: Routledge.

Crosson, P. (1991). State postsecondary education policy systems. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), Foundations of American higher education: An ASHE reader, (pp. 608-619). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Davidson, A. (1994). Ethics as ascetics: Foucault, the history of ethics, and ancient thought. In G. Gutting (Ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Foucault, (pp. 115-140). NY: Cambridge University Press.

Delaporte, F. (Ed.). (1994). A vital rationalist: Selected writings from Georges Canguilhem. New York: Zone Books.

Donald, J. (1992). Sentimental education: Schooling, popular culture and the regulation of liberty. New York: Verso.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1983). Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics. (second ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language (A.M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books. (Original text published 1969).

Foucault, M. (1979a). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison (Alan Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books. (Original text published 1975).

Foucault, M. (1979b). Governmentality. Ideology and Consciousness, 6(Autumn), 5-22. (Original work published 1978).

Foucault, M. (1983). Afterword: The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics, (2nd ed., pp. 208-225). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1990). The history of sexuality, Volume I: An introduction (Robert Hurley, Trans.). New York: Random House (Original work published 1976).

Foucault, M. (1991a). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality, (pp. 87-104). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1978).

Foucault, M. (1991b). Questions of method. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality, (pp. 73-86). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Geyl, P. (1958). Debates with historians. Cleveland, OH: World Publishing Company.

Giroux, H. A. (1991). Rethinking the boundaries of educational discourse: Modernism, postmodernism, and feminism. In H. A. Giroux (Ed.), Postmodernism, feminism, and cultural politics: Redrawing educational boundaries, (pp. 1-59). Albany: SUNY.

Gottdiener, M. (1995). Postmodern semiotics: Material culture and the forms of postmodern life. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Gutting, G. (1989). Michael Foucault's archaeology of scientific reason. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gutting, G. (Ed.). (1994). The Cambridge companion to Foucault. New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Hacking, I. (1991). How should we do the history of statisics? In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality, (pp. 181-196). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hunt, L. (1986). French history in the last twenty years: The rise and fall of the *Annales* paradigm. Journal of Contemporary History, 21(1), 209-24.

Hunt, L. (1989). Introduction: History, culture, and text. In L. Hunt (Ed.), The New Cultural History, (pp. 1-24). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Klein, J. T. (1992). Text/context: The rhetoric of the social science. In R. H. Brown (Ed.), Writing the social text: Poetics and politics in social science discourse, (pp. 9-27). New York: Walter DeGryuter, Inc.

Kurzweil, E. (1980). The age of structuralism: Lévi-Strauss to Foucault. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lemert, C. C. (Ed.). (1981). French sociology: Rupture and renewal since 1968. New York: Columbia University Press.

Millett, J. D. (1981). State governments. In P. G. Altbach & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), Higher education in American society, (pp. 183-206). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1991). A political sociology of educational reform: Power/knowledge in teaching, teacher education, and research. New York: Teachers College Press.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1993). U.S. teacher education reforms: Regulatory practices of the state, university, and research. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), Changing patterns of power: Social regulation and teacher education reform, (pp. 263-302). NY: State Univeristy of New York Press.

Popkewitz, T. S., & Pereyra, M. A. (1993). An eight country study of reform practices in teacher education: An outline of the problematic. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), Changing patterns of power: Social regulation and teacher education reform, (pp. 1-52). NY: State Univeristy of New York Press.

Prestine, N. (1988). Systems theory and the struggle for control of governance in teacher education: A case study : Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Rose, N. (1989). Governing the soul: The shaping of the private self. New York: Routledge.

Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political power beyond the state: Problematics of government. The British Journal of Sociology, 43(2), 173-206.

Tiles, M. (1987). Epistemological history: The legacy of Bachelard and Canguilhem. In A. Griffiths (Ed.), Contemporary French philosophy, (pp. 141-156). Cambridge, MA: University Press.

Van de Graaff, J. H., Clark, B. Q., Furth, D., Goldschmidt, D., & Wheeler, D. (1978). Academic power: Patterns of authority in seven national systems of higher education. New York: Praeger.

White, H. (1978). Introduction: Tropology, discourse and the modes of human consciousness, Tropics of discourse, (pp. 1-25): Johns Hopkins.

Wildavsky, A. (1979). Speaking truth to power. Boston: Little, Brown.

Young, R. (1990). White mythologies: Writing history and the west. New York: Routledge.

Zinn, H. (1985). What is radical history? In S. Vaughn (Ed.), The vital past: Writings on the uses of history, (pp. 158-171). Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia Press.

NOTES

[1] Some of these arguments include the work of Gaston Bachelard, Georges Canguilem, Louis Althusser and Jaques Derrida. Each theorist reinforced their own conceptions of the writing and study of history to produce meaning (see e.g. Bachelard, 1984; Baltas, 1989; Delaporte, 1994; Giroux, 1991; Gottdiener, 1995; Kurzweil, 1980; Tiles, 1987; Young, 1990)

[2] Although an argument could be made for clarifying what is meant by "the university," I am necessarily avoiding doing this. In a sense, it is the university that is being constructed during analysis.

[3] Fiscal and policy control by the state can be viewed as a "trade-off" by the academy. In exchange for limited procedural guarantees of stability and security, many universities accept state control and intervention in organizational structure as a necessary reality (Barrow, 1990).

[4] Throughout this section I draw heavily from Rose and Miller's article and acknowledge their framing of the problemmatics of government (Rose & Miller, 1992).

[5] Foucault states "In other words, the transition which takes place in the eighteenth century from an art of government to a political science, from a regime dominated by structures of sovereignty to one ruled by techniques of government, turns on the theme of population and hence on the birth of the political economy" (Foucault, 1991a, p. 101).

[6] It is also important to recognize that with the creation of governmental technologies came the discursive conditions that enabled them, the *savoir*. Foucault states that with the emergence of governmentality resulted "...on the one hand, in the formation of a whole series of specific governmental apparatuses, and, on the other, in the development of a whole complex of *savoirs*" (Foucault, 1991a, p.103). The *savoir* of a discursive formation provides the objects, types of cognitive authority (enunciative modes), concepts, and themes (theoretical stages) that are necessary for a knowledge of governing (*connaissance*) (Gutting, 1989).

[7] Throughout the analysis I will refer to persons named in the text by their title in order of discussion. For instance, if the person was the department Chair, they would be listed as (Chair). Professors and other staff are listed numerically in order of mention in the text (e.g. Professor 1, Professor 2). For each quotation, I will start numbering at 1. There is no correlation between quotations in respect to the numbers.

[8] It is important to remember, however, what is meant by "discipline" in this analogy. It is not chastisement or punishment of the faculty by DPI. As discussed in chapter two, discipline, from this perspective, is a specific technique of power that regards individuals both as objects and instruments of its exercise.

[9] Foucault states: "Next to the testing rituals... the confession became one of the West's most highly valued techniques for producing truth. We have since become a singularly confession society. The confession has spread far and wide.... One confesses — or is forced to confess. When it is not spontaneous or dictated by some internal imperative, the confession is wrung from a person by violence or threat; it is driven from its hiding place in the soul, or extracted from the body... The most defenseless tenderness and the bloodiest of powers have a similar need of confession. Western man has become a confessing animal" (Foucault, 1990, p. 59).

TM026736

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: RATIONALITY, TECHNOLOGY AND REFORM: EXAMINING THE "GOVERNMENTALITY" OF CERTIFICATION CHANGE	
Author(s): KATHARINA E. HEYNING	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: MARCH 26, 1997

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents

☒

Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

☐

Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: K. Heyning	Printed Name/Position/Title: KATHARINA E. HEYNING
Organization/Address:	Telephone: 608-255-2078 / FAX:
	E-Mail Address: KHEYNING@FALSTAFF.WISC.EDU / Date: 3/26/97

(over)